



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,351	11/27/2001	Chih-Kung Lee	JCLA8275	6055

7590 09/09/2003  
J.C. Patents, Inc.  
Suite  
4 Venture  
Irvine, CA 92618

EXAMINER

SPEARS, ERIC J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2878

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/997,351

Applicant(s)

LEE, ET AL.

Examiner

Eric J Spears

Art Unit

2878

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the cylindrical diffraction grating and the radiate diffraction grating must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding Claim 1, the specification does not teach a means or method as recited in Claim 1, lines 53-60. While the specification teaches removing "the constant portion from the voltage signal that is derived from the light detectors 15 and 16..." it

does not enable the claim as recited. As an example of this, the specification does not teach differentiating signals.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite as it does not recite device elements which are performing the numerous method steps and functions recited in the claim. The claim recited both apparatus elements and method steps in no understandable order, while also reciting functions potentially carried out by claim elements without related these to the recited method steps. The claim does not recite elements which perform various functions but rather only narrative, method step type limitations. The claim apparently recites elements which are contained in the optical head while simultaneously reciting method steps performed by other un-recited elements in the optical head. For example: Claim 1 recites no element which is responsible for transforming the first and second incident lights from the linear to circular polarized state as recited in lines 21-23, nor does the claim clearly recite a method step during which this change occurs. Further, the claim does not recite any element which performs the function alluded to by the phrase "due to reflection" on line 33.

Claim 1 is therefore vague, indefinite and hard to follow and not understood.

Claim 1, line 22 the use of the phrase "focus on" is awkward in its use.

Moreover, no means for focusing is claimed.

Further regarding Claim 1, it is not understood what the term "object that is under measured" is intended to mean.

Claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: a relationship between the object and the other recited elements of the claim, such as the scale.

Further regarding Claim 1, the phrase "are shifted" on line 11 renders the claim vague and indefinite as the claim does not recite what they are shifted with respect to.

Further regarding Claim 1, the claim fails to recite an operable connection between the "a beam path" in claim 1, line 10 and the other elements of the claim. It is also unclear what the "input mechanism" and the "output mechanism" are referring and how these elements are related to the other features of the claim.

Further regarding Claim 1, it is unclear if the lights recited in lines 7-12 are the same or different from the lights recited in lines 13-15. Please clarify.

Claim 1, line 18 recites "polarizing state switch mechanism". It is unclear if and how this element relates to the "polarizing state switch mechanism" recited in Claim 1, line 10.

Further regarding Claim 1, the phrase "differentiating the first orthogonal signal and the second orthogonal signal" is unclear as it is not recited what variable or quantity

the signals are differentiated with respect to. It should also be noted that the specification does not teach a means or method as recited in Claim 1, lines 53-60.

In addition, Claim 1 contains numerous grammatical errors.

Regarding Claim 9, the limitation making the "third quarter wave plate" and "the fourth quarter wave plate" the same element renders the claim indefinite as they are assumed to be different elements when they are initially claimed with different names. Any art which read on the base claim could not read on the dependent claim (i.e. claim 9). This amounts to an elimination of an element.

Claims not specifically mentioned are indefinite due to their dependency from an indefinite base claim.

No art has been applied to these claims as the limitations in claim 1 are so indefinite.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Spears whose telephone number is (703) 306-0033. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:00am to 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Porta can be reached on (703) 308-4852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

EJS  
09/05/03

  
**Que T. Le**  
**Primary Examiner**